

### REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of July 5, 2005 is respectfully requested.

In order to make necessary editorial corrections, the entire specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised. As the revisions are quite extensive, the amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into the attached substitute specification and abstract. For the Examiner's benefit, a marked-up copy of the specification indicating the changes made thereto is also enclosed. No new matter has been added by the revisions. Entry of the substitute specification is thus respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the previously-pending claims due to various informalities. In particular, the Examiner cited several examples of language that is either unclear or lacks proper antecedent basis. However, in order to address these objections and place the original claims in a preferred form, the original claims have now been cancelled and replaced with new claims 14-23. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections to the previously-pending claims have been obviated.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, and 6 as being anticipated by the Schonitzer reference (USP 2,394,014); rejected claims 5-10 as being unpatentable over the Schonitzer reference in view of the Goldsmith reference (USP 6,430,779); rejected claims 7-9 as being unpatentable over the Schonitzer reference in view of the Ferrari '966 reference (USP 5,781,966); and rejected claims 11-13 as being unpatentable over the Schonitzer in view of the Ferrari '164 reference (USP 6,145,164). However, as indicated above, the original claims have now been cancelled and replaced with new claims 14-23. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 14-23 are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

New independent claim 14 is directed to a hinge that includes a frame hinge flap to be located within a recess of a door frame and *which is height-adjustable with respect to the door frame*, a door hinge flap connected to the frame hinge flap, and an insertion pocket to be located within a recess of a door having a hollow profile. The insertion pocket includes an external tab supported by an internal tab and attached to a fitting flange of the door hinge flap, and the

external tab includes an adjustment bolt with an eccentric rotatable cam cooperating with a keyhole-shaped opening in the fitting flange of the door hinge flap *for adjustment of said door hinge flap in a thickness direction of the door*. The insertion pocket also includes set screws which are *operable to adjust a position of the external tab and the door hinge flap relative to a surface of the door in which the recess of the door is formed*. The frame hinge flap, the door hinge flap, and the insertion pocket are shaped and arranged to be located within either the recess of the door frame or the recess of the door when the door is closed so that *the hinge is completely invisible when the door is closed*.

The hinge as recited in new independent claim 14 provides several advantages. Firstly, the hinge has components which allow adjustment in a height direction of a door frame (or door), in a thickness direction of the door, **and** relative to a surface of the door in which the recess of the door is formed (i.e., toward and away from the surface of the narrow side of the door). Thus, the hinge can be easily and accurately installed. Moreover, because the frame hinge flap, the door hinge flap, and the insertion flap (which combined include all of the adjustable features discussed above) are shaped and arranged to be located within either the recess of the door frame or the recess of the door when the door is closed, the hinge is invisible and inaccessible when the door is closed. Therefore, the hinge is more aesthetically pleasing and provides increased security.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that the Schonitzer reference does not disclose the height-adjustable feature recited in original claim 5 (now incorporated into new independent claim 14). Nonetheless, the Examiner asserted that the Goldsmith reference discloses a hinge having a hinge flap that is height-adjustable. In this regard, the Examiner refers to the cover plates 80, 81 to be attached to the *external* surface of frame member 70 as providing the height-adjustable feature. However, the Goldsmith reference does not disclose a height-adjustable frame hinge flap located *within* a recess of the door frame when the door is closed.

The Ferrari '966 reference discloses a base plate 60, an upper element 59, and a cam 32 which provides some adjustment capability. However, these features are not arranged within the recess 12 of door 14 when the door is closed. Moreover, the Ferrari '164 reference also does not

disclose or suggest a hinge capable of being adjusted and made completely invisible when the door is closed, as recited in new independent claim 14.

The Schonitzer reference, the Goldsmith reference, the Ferrari '966 reference and the Ferrari '164 reference do not, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a hinge which is adjustable in the manner recited in claim 14 (at least 3-way adjustability), and which has a frame hinge flap, a door hinge flap, and an insertion pocket shaped and arranged so as to be invisible when the door is closed. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify or combine the references in a manner that would result in the hinge as recited in new independent claim 14. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new independent claim 14 and the claims that depend therefrom are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Harald SITTER

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm

Registration No. 44,142

Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
November 7, 2005